UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/887,402	06/22/2001	Hania Gajewska	14695/002002	7102

32615 7590 04/09/2004

OSHA NOVAK & MAY L.L.P./SUN
1221 MCKINNEY, SUITE 2800
HOUSTON, TX 77010

EXAMINER	
PESIN, BORIS M	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2174	5

DATE MAILED: 04/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/887,402	GAJEWSKA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Boris Pesin	2174	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _____.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-38* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-7,9-12 and 23-38* is/are rejected.

7)☒ Claim(s) *8 and 13-22* is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

13)☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application) since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121 since a specific reference was included in the first sentence of the specification or in an Application Data Sheet. 37 CFR 1.78.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

1. Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Bogdan (US 6249284).

In regards to claim 1, Bogdan teaches a method for remembering a descendent of the inactive window as a next focus owner when the descendent received a focus-in event (i.e. "Multiple layout managers are called upon to identify the next nearest component that can take input focus in the event that the magnitude and/or direction of a requested input focus change is beyond the scope of the set of components to which any one layout manager has responsibility.", Column 2, Line 10); creating a focus proxy for the inactive window and issuing a request to set focus to the focus proxy; marking the next focus owner as the true focus owner when the focus proxy receives a focus-in event (i.e. "Components at the container and/or component level need only be responsible for the tasks of receiving and identifying user generated directional navigation input and of assigning a new input focus to a next component at the direction

of an assigned layout manager." Column 2, Line 1); and directing the focus-in event received by the focus proxy to the true focus owner (i.e. "The navigator portion of each layout manager is responsible for the tasks of processing the directional navigation input by searching for the next nearest component that can take input focus in response to the user generated directional navigation input." Column 2, Line 6).

In regards to claim 2, Bogdan teaches a method wherein the focus-in event received b the descendant is a native focus event generated in response to a request to set focus to the descendant. (i.e. "The navigator portion of each layout manager is responsible for the tasks of processing the directional navigation input by searching for the next nearest component that can take input focus in response to the user generated directional navigation input." Column 2, line 6).

2. Claims 25, 26, 29, 31 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Buxton (US 6469714).

In regards to claim 25, Buxton teaches a method for delivering keystrokes to descendants of an inactive window, comprising: creating a focus proxy for the inactive window (i.e. "Hence, a focus management system was created to centralize focus dependencies. This centralization takes place through a focus proxy. When the InfoCenter receives focus for any reason, the focus is passed to the focus proxy. This proxy is represented by an interface, lotus.ic.ICPopupFocusProxy. This interface is implemented by a class, ICPopupFocusProxyImpl. This implementation takes an AWT Component which is the entity that actually retains the focus." Column 28, Line 32-40) and directing a key event received by the focus proxy to a descendant of the inactive

window (i.e. "The client then defines in their resource bundle a mapping between the semantic and a locale specific key sequence. These are read into the lotus.ic.client.KeyEventTranslator. When a client receives a key event, it is passed into the translator and an ActionDescriptor is returned. This ActionDescriptor represents the action which should be executed. The client then uses lotus.ic.client.ICClientHelper to assert a selection to perform an action passing the ActionDescriptor from the translator. The InfoCenter will then act upon this new selection." Column 28, Line 67 – Column 29, Line 9).

In regards to claim 26, Buxton teaches a method wherein the focus proxy is created when the descendant receives a focus-in event. (i.e. "When the InfoCenter receives focus for any reason, the focus is passed to the focus proxy[and hence it is created]" Column 28, Line 34).

In regards to claim 29, Buxton teaches a method wherein the focus proxy receives the key event when a keystroke is delivered to the descendant (i.e. "The client then defines in their resource bundle a mapping between the semantic and a locale specific key sequence. These are read into the lotus.ic.client.KeyEventTranslator. When a client receives a key event, it is passed into the translator and an ActionDescriptor is returned. This ActionDescriptor represents the action which should be executed. The client then uses lotus.ic.client.ICClientHelper to assert a selection to perform an action passing the ActionDescriptor from the translator. The InfoCenter will then act upon this new selection." Column 28, Line 67 – Column 29, Line 9).

Claims 31 and 32 are in the same context as claims 25, and 26; therefore they are rejected under similar rationale.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

3. Claims 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogdan (US 6249284) in view of Ansberry et al. (US 5557725).

In regards to claim 3, Bogdan teaches all the limitations of claim 2. He does not teach a method wherein remembering the descendant of the inactive window as the next focus owner comprises discarding the focus-in event received by the descendant. Ansbery teaches, "If an input event occurs on a participant who does not have the input focus, and the input focus is not switched (the event was not a transition trigger or a transition rule failed) then the event is discarded" (Column 6, Line 6). It would have

been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bogdan with the teachings of Ansberry and include a method that discards the focus-in event to better manage the computer's input (Ansberry Column 3, Line 46).

In regards to claim 4, Bogdan teaches all the limitations of claim 2. He does not teach a method further comprising discarding a native activation event received by the inactive window, wherein the native activation event is generated in response to the request to set focus to the descendant. Ansberry teaches, "If an input event occurs on a participant who does not have the input focus, and the input focus is not switched (the event was not a transition trigger or a transition rule failed) then the event is discarded" (Column 6, Line 6).

4. Claim 5 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogdan (US 6249284) in view of Hurley et al. (US 6205474).

In regards to claim 5, Bogdan teaches all the limitations of claim 1. He does not teach a method wherein creating a focus proxy for the inactive window comprises creating an invisible child of a nearest owning window of the inactive window that can be active. Hurley teaches, "in a preferred embodiment these child frames may be "invisible" by having a height of zero such that no child frames 36a-36d are displayed on the status window to a user" (Column 7, Line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bogdan with the teachings of Hurley and include a method to create an invisible child associated with a window

with the motivation to provide for an efficient technique for obtaining information in a computer network (Hurley, Column 2, Line 54).

5. Claim 6 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogdan (US 6249284) in view of Hurley et al. (US 6205474) and in further view of Bibayan (US 5922054).

In regards to claim 6, Bogdan and Hurley teach all the limitations of claim 5. They do not teach a method further comprising activating the nearest owning window of the inactive window that can be active. Bibayan teaches, "the client application requests application manager to put the external application in focus, and the application manager in turn asks the windowing operating system to activate the window of the external application so as to put the external application in focus" (Column 3, Line 30). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bogdan and Hurley with the teachings of Bibayan and include a method to activate a window with the motivation to provide for better management of the application (Bibayan Column 2, Line 54).

6. Claims 7, 11, 12, 23, and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogdan (US 6249284) in view of Buxton et al. (US 6469714).

In regards to claim 7, Bogdan teaches all the limitations of claim 1. He does not teach a method wherein the focus-in event received by the focus proxy is a native focus event generated in response to issuing the request to set focus to the focus proxy.

Buxton teaches that, "centralization takes place through a focus proxy. When the InfoCenter receives focus for any reason, the focus is passed to the focus proxy." (Column 28, Line 33). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bogdan with the teachings of Buxton and include a method of sending a focus-in event to the focus proxy with the motivation to provide for dynamic adaptation to specific interface requirements of applets (Buxton, Column 2, Line 36).

In regards to claim 11, Bogdan teaches all the limitations of claim 1. He does not teach a method wherein the focus proxy receives a key event when a keystroke is delivered to the descendent. Buxton teaches that, "centralization takes place through a focus proxy. When the InfoCenter receives focus for any reason, the focus is passed to the focus proxy." (Column 28, Line 33). He further teaches, "The client then defines in their resource bundle a mapping between the semantic and a locale specific key sequence. These are read into the lotus.ic.client.KeyEventTranslator. When a client receives a key event, it is passed into the translator and an ActionDescriptor is returned. This ActionDescriptor represents the action which should be executed. The client then uses lotus.ic.client.ICClientHelper to assert a selection to perform an action passing the ActionDescriptor from the translator. The InfoCenter will then act upon this new selection." (Column 28, Line 67 – Column 29, Line 9).

In regards to claim 12, Bogdan and Buxton teach all the limitations of claim 11. Buxton further teaches a method comprising directing the key event to the true focus owner. "The client then defines in their resource bundle a mapping between the

semantic and a locale specific key sequence. These are read into the lotus.ic.client.KeyEventTranslator. When a client receives a key event, it is passed into the translator and an ActionDescriptor is returned. This ActionDescriptor represents the action which should be executed. The client then uses lotus.ic.client.ICClientHelper to assert a selection to perform an action passing the ActionDescriptor from the translator. The InfoCenter will then act upon this new selection." (Column 28, Line 67 – Column 29, Line 9)

In regards to claim 23, Bogdan teaches a method for remembering a descendent of the inactive window as a next focus owner when the descendent received a focus-in event (i.e. "Multiple layout managers are called upon to identify the next nearest component that can take input focus in the event that the magnitude and/or direction of a requested input focus change is beyond the scope of the set of components to which any one layout manager has responsibility.", Column 2, Line 10); creating a focus proxy for the inactive window and issuing a request to set focus to the focus proxy; marking the next focus owner as the true focus owner when the focus proxy receives a focus-in event (i.e. "Components at the container and/or component level need only be responsible for the tasks of receiving and identifying user generated directional navigation input and of assigning a new input focus to a next component at the direction of an assigned layout manager." Column 2, Line 1); and directing the focus-in event received by the focus proxy to the true focus owner (i.e. "The navigator portion of each layout manager is responsible for the tasks of processing the directional navigation input by searching for the next nearest component that can take input focus in response

to the user generated directional navigation input." Column 2, Line 6). Bogdan does not teach directing a key event received by the focus proxy to the true focus owner. Buxton teaches, "The client then defines in their resource bundle a mapping between the semantic and a locale specific key sequence. These are read into the lotus.ic.client.KeyEventTranslator. When a client receives a key event, it is passed into the translator and an ActionDescriptor is returned. This ActionDescriptor represents the action which should be executed. The client then uses lotus.ic.client.ICClientHelper to assert a selection to perform an action passing the ActionDescriptor from the translator. The InfoCenter will then act upon this new selection." (Column 28, Line 67 – Column 29, Line 9). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bogdan with the teachings of Buxton and include a method of directing key event received my the focus proxy to the true focus owner with the motivation to provide for a user interface that is suitable for use with network computers and dynamics of distributed computing (Buxton, Column 2, Line 38).

In regards to claim 24, it is inherent in Buxton's invention that a key event is generated in response to a user delivering keystrokes to the descendent.

7. Claims 9 and 10 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Bogdan (US 6249284) in view of Halviatti et al. (US 5790117).

In regards to claim 9, Bogdan teaches all the limitations of claim 1. He does not teach a method wherein the descendant of the inactive window receives the focus-in

event in response to a user clicking on the descendant. Halviatti teaches, "any possible operation that a user would perform on any given UI element, such as a mouse click, to getting focus, pressing a key, and the like" (Column 31, Line 44). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Bogdan with the teachings of Halviatti and include a method of changing focus in response to a user click with the motivation to have an easy method of switching focus.

In regards to claim 10, Bogdan teaches all the limitations of claim 1. He does not teach a method wherein the descendant of the inactive window receives the focus-in event in response to the descendant issuing a focus request through function invocation. Halviatti teaches, "Line 2 executes the Set() member function of ActiveDlg.Filename, which is an instance of a Edit box GEM. The function sets focus to the Filename edit box within the File Open dialog and sends the key sequence "test.txt" to the edit box." (Column 38, Line 20).

8. Claims 27, 28, 33, and 34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buxton (US 6469714) in view of Halviatti et al. (US 5790117).

In regards to claim 27, Buxton teaches all the limitations of claim 26. He does not teach a method wherein the descendant of the inactive window receives the focus-in event in response to a user clicking on the descendant. Halviatti teaches, "any possible operation that a user would perform an any given UI element, such as a mouse click, to getting focus, pressing a key, and the like" (Column 31, Line 44). It would have been

obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Buxton with the teachings of Halviatti and include a method of changing focus in response to a user click with the motivation to have an easy method of switching focus.

In regards to claim 28, Buxton teaches all the limitations of claim 26. He does not teach a method wherein the descendant of the inactive window receives the focus-in event in response to the descendant issuing a focus request through function invocation. Halviatti teaches, "Line 2 executes the Set() member function of ActiveDlg.Filename, which is an instance of a Edit box GEM. The function sets focus to the Filename edit box within the File Open dialog and sends the key sequence "test.txt" to the edit box." (Column 38, Line 20).

Claims 33 and 34 are in the same context as claims 27 and 28; therefore they are rejected under similar rationale.

9. Claims 30 and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buxton (US 6469714) in view of Hurley et al. (US 6205474).

In regards to claim 30, Buxton teaches all the limitations of claim 29. He does not teach a method wherein creating the focus proxy comprises determining the nearest owning window of the inactive window that can be active and creating an invisible child of the nearest owning window of the inactive window that can be active as the focus proxy. Hurley teaches, "in a preferred embodiment these child frames may be

"invisible" by having a height of zero such that no child frames 36a-36d are displayed on the status window to a user" (Column 7, Line 8). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Buxton with the teachings of Hurley and include a method to create an invisible child window and associate it with a focus proxy with the motivation to provide for an efficient technique for obtaining information in a computer network (Hurley, Column 2, Line 54).

Claim 38 is in the same context as claim 30; therefore it is rejected under similar rationale.

10. Claims 35, 36, and 37 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Buxton (US 6469714) in view of Bogdan (US 6249284).

In regards to claim 35, Buxton teaches all the limitations of claim 31. He does not teach a method wherein the program further comprises instructions for remembering the descendant as the next focus owner when the descendant receives the focus-in event. Bogdan teaches, "Multiple layout managers are called upon to identify the next nearest component that can take input focus in the event that the magnitude and/or direction of a requested input focus change is beyond the scope of the set of components to which any one layout manager has responsibility." (Column 2, Line 10). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to modify Buxton with the teachings of Bogdan and include a method of figuring out which window has focus with the motivation to provide for a more flexible and uniform system (Bogdan, Column 1, Line 55).

In regards to claim 36, Buxton and Bogdan teach all the limitations of claim 35. Buxton does not teach a method wherein the program further comprises instructions for marking the next focus owner as the true focus owner when the focus proxy receives a focus-in event. Bogdan teaches, "Components at the container and/or component level need only be responsible for the tasks of receiving and identifying user generated directional navigation input and of assigning a new input focus to a next component at the direction of an assigned layout manager." (Column 2, Line 1).

In regards to claim 37, Buxton and Bogdan teach all the limitations of claim 35. Buxton does not teach a method wherein the program further comprises instructions for directing the focus-in event received by the focus proxy to the true focus owner. Bogdan teaches, "The navigator portion of each layout manager is responsible for the tasks of processing the directional navigation input by searching for the next nearest component that can take input focus in response to the user generated directional navigation input." (Column 2, Line 6).

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 8 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 8 would be allowable over prior art because prior art does not show a method comprising discarding a native focus-out event received by the descendant,

wherein the native focus-out event is generated in response to the request to set focus to the focus proxy.

Claims 13-22 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Claims 13-22 would be allowable over prior art because prior art does not show a method comprising determining a component gaining focus when the focus proxy receives a focus-out event.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Boris Pesin whose telephone number is (703) 305-8774. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday except every other Friday.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine Kincaid can be reached on (703) 308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kristine Kincaid

KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100